1 2 3 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 (SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION) 10 11 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) Case No. 07-5944 JST ANTITRUST LITIGATION MDL No. 1917 12 13 This Document Relates to: 14 Best Buy Co., Inc. et al. v. Hitachi Ltd., et al., 15 No. 3:11-cv-05513; 16 Best Buy Co., Inc., et al. v. Technicolor SA, 17 et al., No. 13-cv-05264; 18 CompuCom Systems, Inc. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al. [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING 19 No. 2:11-cv-06396; THE DAPS' MOTION FOR **ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF** 20 Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd, et al., **PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-11** 21 Case No. 11-cv-06397; FOR PERMISSION TO BE **HEARD AT THE HEARING ON** 22 **NOVEMBER 23, 2015** Costco Wholesale Corporation v. 23 Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05723; 24 Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v. Hitachi, 25 Ltd., et al., No. 3:11-cv-01656; 26 Electrograph Systems, Inc., et al. v. 27 Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05724; 28

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING THE DAPS' MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-11 FOR PERMISSION TO BE HEARD AT THE HEARING ON NOVEMBER 23, 2015 Case No. 07-5944 JST; MDL No. 1917

1	Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Hitachi, Ltd. et al.,	7
2	No. 3:11-cv-06275;	
3	Interbond Corp. of Am. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05727;	
4		
5	P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp., et al., v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:12-cv-02648;	
6		
7	P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corporation, et al. v. Technicolor SA, et al., No. 13-cv-05725;	
8		
9		
10	Schultze Agency Services, LLC v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No. 3:12-cv-2649;	
11		
12	Schultze Agency Services, LLC v. Technicolor SA, Ltd., et al., No. 13-cv-05668;	
13		
14	Sharp Elec. Corp. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al. No.	
15	3:13-cv-01173;	
16	Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Koninklijke	
17	<i>Philips Electronics N.V., et al.</i> , No. 13-cv-2776; and	
18		
19	Tech Data Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al., No.13-cv-00157.	
20	110.13-64-00137.	
21		
22		
23		
23		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING THE DAPS' MOTIO CIVIL L.R. 7-11 FOR PERMISSION TO BE HEAR	

1	Upon consideration of the DAPs' Motion for Administrative Relief Pursuant to Civil		
2	L.R. 7-11 For Permission to be Heard at the Hearing on November 23, 2015, and the papers		
3	and declarations submitted by the parties in connection with that Motion, it is hereby:		
4	ORDERED that the Administrative Motion is DENIED.		
5			
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
7			
8			
9	Dated:		
10	HONORABLE JON S. TIGAR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
12			
13			
14			
15 16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING THE DAPS' MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF PURSUANT		

[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING THE DAPS' MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO CIVIL L.R. 7-11 FOR PERMISSION TO BE HEARD AT THE HEARING ON NOVEMBER 23, 2015

Case No. 07-5944 JST; MDL No. 1917